

COSMIC ANTIMATTER: MODELS AND PHENOMENOLOGY

A.D. Dolgov

*ITEP, 117218, Moscow, Russia**INFN, Ferrara 40100, Italy**University of Ferrara, Ferrara 40100, Italy*

Abstract

The possibility of creation of cosmologically significant antimatter are analyzed in different scenarios of baryogenesis. It is argued that there may exist plenty of antimatter even in our Galaxy. Possible forms of antimatter objects and their observational signatures are discussed.

Prediction of antimatter made by P.A.M. Dirac [1] and the discovery of anti-electron, i.e. positron [2] was surely the most impressive result of quantum field theory of the XX century. The whole new world of elementary particles was predicted and Dirac naturally suggested that “If we accept the view of complete symmetry between positive and negative electric charge so far as concerns the fundamental laws of Nature, we must regard it rather as an accident that the Earth (and presumably the whole solar system), contains a preponderance of negative electrons and positive protons. It is quite possible that for some of the stars it is the other way about, these stars being built up mainly of positrons and negative protons. In fact, there may be half of stars of each kind.”

It is striking that 30 years before Dirac and one year after discovery of electron (J.J. Thomson, 1897) A. Schuster [3] (another British physicist) conjectured that there might be other sign electricity, which he called *antimatter*, and supposed that there might be entire solar systems, made of antimatter and indistinguishable from ours. He even made an ingenious (or wild) guess that matter and antimatter are capable to annihilate and produce vast energy.

Today it is established beyond any doubt that for each particle there exists an antiparticle (except for a few absolutely neutral ones, as e.g. photons) but the expectations that half of the universe may consist of antimatter are more dead than alive. To a large extent this attitude is stimulated by the Sakharov theory of baryogenesis [4] which successfully explained the observed cosmological predominance of matter over antimatter.

Though observations strongly restrict possible existence of antimatter domains and objects, as is discussed below, it is still not excluded that antimatter may be abundant in the universe and even in the Galaxy, not too far from us. This remaining freedom will be either eliminated by the existing (BESS [5], AMS [6], PAMELA [7]) and planned (AMS-2 [8], PEBS [9], and GAPS [10]) missions for search of cosmic antimatter or anti-stars or total anti-solar systems, as was envisaged by Schuster and Dirac, will be discovered.

Possible existence of anti-worlds depends upon the mechanism of breaking of symmetry between particles and antiparticles, i.e. on physics of C and CP violation. From the cosmological point of view there are three types of such violation:

1. Explicit, by complex parameters in Lagrangian, as is usually assumed in particle physics.
2. Spontaneous, by a vacuum expectation value (v.e.v.) of a real pseudoscalar field [11] or a complex scalar or pseudoscalar field. Such mechanism is locally indistinguishable from the explicit one but globally leads to charge symmetric universe, consisting of equal amount of matter and antimatter. This mechanism suffers from a serious domain wall problem which jeopardizes

homogeneity and isotropy of the observed universe [12].

3. Dynamical or stochastic CP-breaking [13] enforced by a (pseudo)scalar field shifted from the equilibrium position and not yet relaxed to equilibrium point at baryogenesis. It could operate only in the early universe and disappeared without trace today and thus it is free of the domain wall problem. Of course an additional source of CP-violation effective only in cosmology is at odds with the Occam razor, but nevertheless it must work in the early universe if there exists a scalar field with mass smaller than the Hubble parameter during inflation, $m < H_{inf}$.

Scenarios of baryogenesis with explicit C(CP)-violation lead to creation of the universe devoid of noticeable antimatter, at least in the simplest versions of the models.

Spontaneous C(CP)-violation evidently predicts alternating matter and antimatter domains but, according to the results of ref. [14] the domain size should be very large so that the nearest domain may be at least at the distance comparable to the cosmological horizon, $l_B \sim \text{Gpc}$. However, in some versions of the scenarios of the domain wall formation and elimination this bound may be relaxed (work in progress).

An interesting possibility is the combined action of explicit plus spontaneous C(CP)-violation [15] but probably it is strongly restricted, if not excluded, because it leads to too large angular fluctuations of CMB and distortion of big bang nucleosynthesis.

The third mechanism of stochastic C(CP) breaking is probably most suitable for creation of cosmologically interesting antimatter, moreover such mechanism naturally works in popular spontaneous [16] and Affleck and Dine [17] scenarios of baryogenesis. However, the versions of the models of cosmic antimatter creation suggested ref. [18] seem to suffer from excessive density perturbations at large scales which are excluded by observations.

A promising scenario of significant antimatter creation in our neighborhood was proposed in ref. [19], which I will discuss in some details below, as well as its cosmological manifestations [20]. The model predicts that antimatter is mostly concentrated in compact stellar like objects (probably dead stars) or dense clouds of antimatter and usual matter. These dense matter and antimatter objects have equal share in the total cosmological mass density and may contribute significant fraction of dark matter in our galaxy and in the universe, possibly even 100%.

On the other hand, there are quite strong observational bounds on possible antimatter in the universe. The nearest antigalaxy in our supercluster cannot be closer than at $\sim 10 \text{ Mpc}$ [21]. Otherwise the annihilation of intergalactic gas from our supercluster inside such an anti-galaxy would create too large flux of gamma quanta with energy around 100 MeV. Analogous arguments exclude fraction of anti-matter inside two colliding galaxies (Bullet Cluster) larger than 3×10^{-6} [22]. These bounds together with cosmic ray data, that the fraction of $\bar{p}$ in cosmic rays is less than 10^{-4} and the fraction of antihelium is smaller than 3×10^{-8} [5] seem to exclude large amount of antimatter in our Galaxy. However these bounds are valid if antimatter makes exactly the same type objects as the OBSERVED matter, as is usually assumed. For example, compact objects made of antimatter may be abundant, live in the Galaxy, but still escape observations, as we see in what follows.

To create compact high density baryonic and antibaryonic objects we rely on the Affleck-Dine mechanism of baryogenesis [17]. According to this mechanism a scalar baryon, χ , condenses along flat directions of its potential and accumulates very big baryonic charge, B , later released in the decays of χ into quarks. If χ acquires high B value homogeneously in all space, it would end up with the universe with constant and large baryon or antibaryon asymmetry. However, if the window to the flat direction is open only during a short period, cosmologically small but possibly astronomically large bubbles with high B could be created, occupying a small fraction of the

cosmological volume, while the rest of the universe would have the normal baryon asymmetry:

$$\beta = N_B/N_\gamma \approx 6 \times 10^{-10}, \quad (1)$$

while inside the high B-bubbles the asymmetry may be of order unity or even larger.

Such rather unusual inhomogeneous modification of the Affleck-Dine mechanism can be realized by a very simple modification of the potential of the Affleck-Dine field χ . We assume that χ has the usual Coleman-Weinberg potential [23] plus general renormalizable coupling to inflaton field Φ :

$$U(\chi, \Phi) = \lambda_1 |\chi|^2 (\Phi - \Phi_1)^2 + \lambda_2 |\chi|^4 \ln(|\chi|^2/\sigma^2) + m_0^2 |\chi|^2 + (m_1^2 \chi^2 + h.c.), \quad (2)$$

where Φ_1 is some constant value which Φ passes in the course of inflation but not too long before the end of inflation, otherwise the high B-regions would be too large. The mass parameter m_1 may be complex but CP would be still conserved, because one can “phase rotate” χ to eliminate complex parameters in the Lagrangian. It is essential that the last term is not invariant with respect to $U(1)$ transformation, $\chi \rightarrow \exp(i\Theta)\chi$, and thus it breaks B-conservation. Potential (2) has one minimum at $\chi = 0$ for large and small Φ and has a deeper minimum at non-zero χ when Φ is close to Φ_1 . At that time the chances for χ to reach a high value at the other minimum are non-negligible.

The probability for χ to reach the deeper minimum is determined by the quantum diffusion at inflationary stage. It is governed by the diffusion equation [24]:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{P}}{\partial t} = \frac{H^3}{8\pi^2} \sum_{k=1,2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{P}}{\partial \chi_k^2} + \frac{1}{3H} \sum_{k=1,2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi_k} \left[\mathcal{P} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \chi_k} \right] \quad (3)$$

where $\chi = \chi_1 + i\chi_2$. The inflation may be not exact and H_I may depend upon time but this does not significantly influence the spectrum of the produced bubbles with high baryonic density.

It can be shown [19] that the mass spectrum of the high B bubbles has log normal form:

$$\frac{dn}{dM} = C_M \exp[-\gamma \ln^2(M/M_0)] \quad (4)$$

where C_M , γ , and M_0 are some constant model dependent parameters.

According to this scenario the universe would look as a huge piece of swiss cheese with high B bubbles instead of holes and homogeneous background with constant baryonic density. The mass of those high B objects is model dependent and can be of the order of stellar mass or even larger or much smaller. Despite their small size the mass fraction of the bubbles could be comparable or even larger than the observed baryonic mass fraction.

Initially the density contrast between the bubbles with high values of χ and the bulk with $\chi \sim 0$ was small. Later, when the mass of χ came into play, the matter inside the bubbles with a large amplitude of χ became nonrelativistic and the density contrast started to rise. The rise continued till χ decayed into light quarks and/or leptons and the matter inside became relativistic as in the bulk of the universe. The second period of the rising perturbations took place after the QCD phase transition at $T = T_{QCD} \sim 100$ MeV, when relativistic quarks confined to make nonrelativistic nucleons.

The final state of the high B-bubble depends upon their mass and radius. If the density contrast was large, $\delta\rho/\rho \geq 1$ at horizon crossing, the bubbles would form primordial black holes (PBH). The mass inside horizon at cosmological time t is equal to:

$$M_{hor} \approx m_{Pl}^2 t \approx 10^{38} \text{ g (t/sec)} \approx 10^5 M_\odot \text{ (t/sec)}, \quad (5)$$

where $M_\odot$ is the Solar mass. At the moment of QCD phase transition the mass inside horizon is about $M_\odot$, while during big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) the mass inside horizon varies from $10^5 M_\odot$ to $10^7 M_\odot$. So as a by-product the considered scenario allows for formation of superheavy black holes whose origin is not well explained by conventional mechanisms.

One should keep in mind that not only black holes but some other compact objects could be formed too. If PBH had not been formed, the subsequent evolution of the B-bubble depends upon the relation between their mass and the Jeans mass. Bubbles with $\delta\rho/\rho < 1$ but with $M_B > M_{Jeans}$ at horizon would decouple from cosmological expansion and form compact stellar type objects or lower density clouds. Such anti-objects could survive against an early annihilation. Moreover, the annihilation products would be practically unnoticeable. According to the estimates of ref. [20], the fraction of extra energy produced by the annihilation on the surface of the compact stellar-like anti-objects would not exceed about 10^{-15} of CMB.

The bubbles with high baryonic number density, after they decoupled from the cosmological expansion, would have higher temperature than the background. The luminosity due to thermal emission into external space would be $L \approx 10^{39}$ erg/sec for the bubbles with solar mass. Even if these high-B bubbles make all cosmological dark matter, i.e. $\Omega_{BB} = 0.25$, the thermal keV photons would have the energy density not more than $10^{-4} - 10^{-5}$ of the energy density of CMBR, red-shifted today to the background light [20].

Some of those high density baryonic and antibaryonic objects might be similar to red giants core. The dominant internal energy source of these objects would be the nuclear helium burning through the reaction $3He^4 \rightarrow C^{12}$, however with larger T by factor ~ 2.5 in comparison with red giants. Since $L \sim T^{40}$, the nuclear power exhaust would be very fast, with life-time shorter than 10^9 s. The total energy outflux would be below 10^{-4} of CMBR. It is unclear if the nuclear reactions could lead to the B-ball explosion and creation of solar mass anti-cloud. Astrophysics of such early formed high density objects is not yet studied.

Thus sufficiently large compact anti-objects could survive in the early universe, especially if they are PBHs. A kind of early dense stars might be formed with initial pressure outside larger than that inside, which introduced an additional stabilizing factor for their survival. Such “stars” would evolve quickly and, in particular, could make early supernovae which would enrich the universe with heavy (anti)nuclei and re-ionize the universe. Energy release from stellar like objects in the early universe is small compared to the energy density of CMB. The objects with high (anti)baryonic number are not dangerous for the standard outcome of big bang nucleosynthesis since the volume of such B-bubbles is small. However, all above are the results of some simplified estimates and more rigorous calculations are necessary.

In the present day universe the antimatter bubbles created by the discussed above mechanism may form all kinds of antimatter objects populating the Galaxy or its halo. They could make dense clouds of antimatter, isolated antistars, which are most probably evolved and not shining, anti-black holes, which are indistinguishable from the black holes made of the usual matter, except for possible anti-atmosphere of non-collapsed primordial antimatter.

The observational signatures of such antimatter objects are almost evident. They include the standard list of 100 MeV gamma background, excessive antiprotons, and low energy positrons. For all these observations an alternative explanations cannot be a priori excluded, but an observation of cosmic antinuclei, starting from anti-helium and heavier ones would be unambiguous proof of existence of primordial antimatter.

One can also expect to see compact sources of γ radiation, which are not associated with shining stars. The chemical content of those objects maybe be different from the normal stars, because they were created from matter processed through BBN with unusually high baryon-to-

photon ratio. So an observation of compact stellar-like objects in the sky or clouds with unusual chemistry would be a strong indication that such objects are made of antimatter and search for annihilation around them has chance to be successful.

There could also be some catastrophic phenomena generated by the star-antistar collisions, processes similar to hypernova explosions induced by transfer of material in double star-antistar system. A capture of compact antistar by a red giant would lead to a noticeable change of the red giant luminosity over a time interval of the order of a month.

To summarize both theory and observations allow for abundant cosmic antimatter in the Galaxy and in its halo and the search of cosmic antinuclei, excessive antiprotons and positrons, gamma-quanta from the antiproton and positron annihilation, and striking astrophysical phenomena due to star-antistar interactions have a non-negligible chance to be discovered.

References

- [1] P.A.M. Dirac, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, A117, 610 (1928).
- [2] C.D. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* 43, 491 (1933).
- [3] A. Schuster, *Nature*, 58, 367 (1898).
- [4] A.D. Sakharov, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 5, 32 (1967); *JETP Lett.* 5, 24 (1967).
- [5] M. Sasaki, et al, BESS Collaboration, *Advances in Space Research*, 42, Issue 3, 450 (2008).
- [6] AMS Collaboration, arXiv:hep-ex/0002048v1
- [7] M. Boezio et al, PAMELA Collaboration, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 110, 062002 (2008). P. Picozza, A. Morselli, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 120, 042004 (2008).
- [8] AMS-2 home page: <http://ams-02project.jsc.nasa.gov> .
- [9] H. Gast, P. von Doetinchem, T. Kirn, G.R. Yearwood, S. Schael, *Proceedings of the 30th International Cosmic Ray Conference*,
R. Caballero, J.C.D. Olivo, G. Medina-Tanco, L. Nellen, F.A. Sánchez, J.F. Valdés-Galicia (eds.), Mexico City, Mexico, 2008 Vol. 2 (OG part 1), page 293.
- [10] See e.g.: <http://www.cita.utoronto.ca/~kaya/gaps.html>
- [11] T.D. Lee, *Phys. Rept.* 9, 43 (1974).
- [12] Ya.B. Zeldovich, I.Yu. Kobzarev, L.B. Okun, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 67, 3 (1974); *Sov. Phys. JETP* 40, 1 (1974).
- [13] A.D. Dolgov, *Phys. Repts.* 222, 309 (1992);
A.D. Dolgov, “CP violation in cosmology” in Proc. of International School of Physics ”Enrico Fermi”: CP Violation: From Quarks to Leptons, Varenna, Italy, 19-29 Jul 2005. Published in “Varenna 2005, CP violation”, 407-438; e-Print: hep-ph/0511213 and references therein.
- [14] A.G. Cohen, A. De Rujula, S.L. Glashow, *Astrophys. J.*, 495, 539 (1998).
- [15] V.A. Kuzmin, M.E. Shaposhnikov, I.I. Tkachev, *Phys. Lett.* B105, 167 (1981); V.A. Kuzmin, I.I. Tkachev, M.E. Shaposhnikov, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 33, 557 (1981).

- [16] A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan, *Nucl. Phys.*, B308, 913 (1988).
- [17] I. Affleck, M. Dine, *Nucl. Phys.*, B249, 361 (1985).
- [18] M.Yu. Khlopov, S.G. Rubin, A.S. Sakharov, *Phys.Rev.* **D** 62, 083505 (2000);
M.Yu. Khlopov, S.G. Rubin, A.S. Sakharov, Talk given at 14th Rencontres de Blois:
Matter - Anti-matter Asymmetry, Chateau de Blois, France, 17-22 Jun 2002, e-Print:
hep-ph/0210012.
- [19] A. Dolgov, J. Silk, *Phys. Rev.* **D** 47, 4244 (1993);
A.D. Dolgov, M. Kawasaki, N. Kevlishvili, *Nucl. Phys.* **B** 807, 229 (2009),.
- [20] C. Bambi, A.D. Dolgov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B** 784, 132 (2007).
- [21] G. Steigman, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* 14, 339 (1976).
- [22] G. Steigman, arXiv:0808.1122.
- [23] S.R. Coleman, E. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D** 7, 1888 (1973).
- [24] A.A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett.* **B** 117, 175 (1982).